

181
Mr. HALHED'S

ESSAY #41

ON

THE SLAIN LAMB

OF THE

REVELATIONS.

AND

OBSERVATIONS

ON

MR. BROTHERS'S

PRESENT CONFINEMENT.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR G. RIEBAU, NO. 439, STRAND, NEAR
BUCKINGHAM-STREET.

1795.

24277.4.10



G. F. Parkman fund

ESSAY

BY MR. HALHED.

THERE are certain persons who, when they find themselves unable to withstand the force of argument and authority of evidence contained in Mr. Brothers's books, as bearing on the great points of his prophetic and princely character, rather than acknowledge a clear, unequivocal conviction of his whole work, are content to nibble at particular ideas or incidental expressions, and hope to establish their own infallibility on the detection of what they are pleased to stile *Errors* (however subordinate and trifling) in those wonderful compositions. Among the instances that may be remarked of this exercise of microscopical objection, is an attempt to derogate (by a side-glance) from the orthodoxy and veracity of an assertion made by Mr. Brothers, in the last addition to his second book, page 98. wherein he observes, that *the Lamb standing on Mount Sion* (Rev. chap. xiv. 1.) *is himself*. The cry in opposition to this doctrine is, that Christ alone can be the Lamb there mentioned. Now that our blessed Saviour has been typified in Scripture by that animal, it is impossible to controvert: as in St. John, chap. i. 29. and Acts viii. 32.—*Therefore*, say the Commentators, every mention of a Lamb must necessarily allude to the same Divine Being exclusively. And thus in a late publication by G. Coggan, it is roundly affirmed, that “*Our Lord Jesus Christ can alone be the Lamb slain.*” To set this matter clearly to rights is the business of the present Essay.

The first mention of the *Lamb* in the Revelation is in the 5th chapter, where St. John (in his vision) *beholds a Lamb as it had been slain*, standing before the Throne. *As it had been slain*, not actually and bonâ fide *slain*; just as the Saint mentions of himself in the 1st chapter and 17th verse, that when he saw the *one like the Son of Man*, he “fell at his feet *as dead* :” not *really* dead, but dead in appearance, and by way of similitude only. The very same simple particle *ως* in the Greek is applied alike in both passages. This *Lamb*, which St. John tells us he saw, stood before the Throne. Was the throne then vacant? No: ONE sat on it, “to *look upon* like a Jasper, and a Sardine stone,” The Saint therefore *saw* the ONE sitting on the throne, and in the 11th chapter, ver. 16. he says expressly, that it was God. Now we know, that no man can *see* the Father, but through the Son, and as Christ himself has declared, “I and my Father are ONE,” and again, “He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,” no man will venture to affirm, that He, who was thus *seen on the throne*, was not Christ. And if it were Christ, can it be possible for a moment to alledge that Christ was at one and the same instant *seen sitting on the throne*, as God, and standing before the throne, as a slain lamb? This indeed would be a curious mode of multiplying persons in the Godhead, and poze Athanasius himself to reconcile to our credulity.

The office which this *Lamb* is here represented as performing, consisted in taking the sealed Book from the ONE on the throne, as being alone judged worthy to open its seals. But he is also emphatically denominated in the same place, “*the Lion of the tribe of Juda*,” as to whom the same worthiness is attributed. Now we must take care to recollect all the time, that this *Lion-like Lamb* necessarily alludes to *a man*, and nothing but a man; for St. John “wept much, because *no man*

was found worthy to open and to read the book." Nor indeed could this Lamb possibly by any implication be at this time considered *as Christ*, who had now since his resurrection received all power, glory, and dominion from the Father, and therefore his worthiness could not here be a matter in doubt or question.

From this allegory we cannot but learn that the *Man* who was found worthy to open the seals, how much soever he might by meekness of temper and universal philanthropy deserve to be typified by a Lamb, yet that in another sense he partook so much of the attributes of *War*, as to merit the appellation of *Lion*. Now I think all the Commentators, assisted by all their Concordances, cannot produce a single passage from Scripture, wherein Christ, by allusion either to his character, his life, or his functions, can be made to hold any similitude with a *Lion*. He was, indeed, "brought as a Lamb to the slaughter," but he resisted not, neither opened he his mouth: *very unlike a Lion*.

But then, it will be urged, if the Lamb in the Revelation be not Christ, what means the phrase of "Lamb slain, or "*as it had been slain*," inasmuch as Christ *was slain* for our offences? To this I answer, the Lamb alludes to Mr. Brothers, as well in those several passages where the epithet *slain* is applied, as in others, where he is mentioned as *standing on Mount Sion*, or where his marriage-supper is recorded, &c. And to establish that he also suffers *for us*, as the Revelation observes, we need only recollect, that if Mr. Brothers had not voluntarily subjected himself to human laws, and to the chance of ill usage, (as he himself states in his book) by interceding for the safety of London, and determining to stay in it till the moment of his being revealed, for the purpose of *rescuing us from perdition*, if possible, he would have been removed from this coun-

try, and had the choice of being superior to all human power whatever.

Now to prove, that Mr. BROTHERS, considered as the *Lamb*, may well be denominated slain, I shall simply appeal to facts that cannot be disputed, and which we can establish at any time by sufficient evidence.

“ The Jury which sat on Friday evening the 27th of March last, at the King’s Arms, Palace-Yard, Westminster, *a common tavern*, under a commission to inquire into the sanity of Mr. Brothers, after having examined a woman who lodged in the same house, and heard a few extracts read from his books, (and also with some few other preliminary inquiries relative to distant dates from some man of the Admiralty) brought in a verdict of Lunacy.

Every man will admit that a lunatic, pronounced to be so by a Jury, is DEAD IN LAW. He can perform no one *human* function whatever : and only shares with brute animals the privilege of breathing. If therefore a verdict of a Jury, convictive of lunacy, cause a man to be *dead*, or in a state *as it had been dead*, a groundless, a surreptitious, or a false verdict of lunacy must necessarily be admitted as *slaying* the man, and is neither more nor less than *civil murder*. Whether or not the verdict in question be deserving of such an insinuation, I leave every man to judge for himself as also, how far the precedent may be found convenient to any future Administration in any other case, when a man (however innocent) may have happened to attract too much popular notice.

I only say, that none of those who were most competent to decide on the actual state of mind of Richard Brothers, from habitual intercourse, from personal knowledge, and epistolary correspondence (*and who are all ready to testify to the perfect soundness of his intellect*) up to the very day of

his arrest, *on suspicion of treasonable practices*, (mark the consistency of the proceedings!) were called upon as evidences, or *even suffered to enter the Jury Room*: and that as far as human cunning could contrive, the day of assembling this jury, and the very intention of assembling any jury at all, were kept an impenetrable secret. Nor less mysterious was the subsequent concealment of the tenor of the verdict. For although it is now well known, that this verdict of lunacy was brought in at the very meeting, *before ever the person to be decided on was examined at all*, yet on the 29th and 30th of March, full three days after the fact, did the messenger, Mr. Ross, in whose custody Mr. Brothers still remains, *deny to me*, in presence of a gentleman whom I took with me as a witness, that the jury *had given any verdict whatever*.

Thus then by an arrest, under warrant of the Secretary of State, on suspicion of treasonable practices, was Mr. Brothers deprived of his liberty: by an inconsiderate verdict of a jury deciding on incompetent evidence, and on evidence even worse than none at all, was he surreptitiously incapacitated from every function of civil life, and reduced virtually to the situation of an object to be protected by the new *dead-body bill*: by a close and severe confinement, already of above six weeks, in an obscure room, in an obscure street, is he robbed of all the comfort of light, air and exercise: and by a most deliberate refinement of cruelty, from the first moment of his arrest as a traitor to the present hour of his detention as a madman, has he been constantly denied the privilege of seeing a single friend to divert his solitary reflections, or sympathize with his unprecedented sufferings.

Shall we then hesitate an instant to denominate *him* the Lamb as it had been slain, who has thus, by the most unheard of contrivances, been made

the victim of a *civil death*, and who has hitherto borne it without a murmur, or a reproach? *Slain* indeed, we may well call him: but if any man chuse rather to deem him simply *buried alive*, I shall not quarrel with the expression.

I would, however, most humbly beg our Rulers to recollect, that if a man can be convicted of Lunacy in March, 1795, for books written in 1794, and 1793, or for words and actions remarked of him in 1792, (leaving all consideration of his actual state of intellect, as known to his intimate friends *at present*, out of the question) they go near to establish a precedent which Mr. Burke might say, “ would hurl the Monarch from his throne, and reduce him to the situation of a peasant ”

By these few obvious and cursory remarks, I hope I have amply satisfied the scruples of the tenderest conscience, that the *Lamb standing on Mount Sion* is really and truly Mr. Brothers, and that the *Lamb slain* is Mr. Brothers also: and I am sure I have proved that the Lamb (as mentioned in the Revelations) *is not and cannot possibly be our* LORD JESUS CHRIST.—And I wish those persons, who have been led by want of reflection to a contrary opinion, would, by a timely sense of their error, endeavour to avert from themselves, the sad consequences of so gross a misrepresentation.

NAT. BRASSEY HALHED.

Pall Mall, 15th April, 1795.

P. S. In speaking of the examination of Mr. Brothers before the jury *de lunatico inquirendo*, I forgot to mention that it was attended also by two physicians, vulgarly called *mad doctors*, who were fastened on him by order of government a few days after his imprisonment: that if he were not mad, their attendance might at least give some weight to the imputation.

.
y
o
a
e
ne